	Case 2:07-cv-00064-MJP Document 7	Filed 02/21/07 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
6		
7	DAVID MURESAN,	
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	No. C07-0064P
10	PRIME WEST,	ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE
11	Defendant.	
12		
13	On February 7, 2007, the Court issued an order to show cause why Plaintiff's case against	
14	Defendant Prime West should not be dismissed because this Court lacks jurisdiction to grant the relief	
15	requested by Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 5). Plaintiff has submitted a timely response to the Court's order.	
16	(Dkt. No. 6). Having reviewed Plaintiff's response to the order to show cause and the balance of the	
17	record in this case, the Court finds and ORDERS as follows:	
18	(1) To the extent that Plaintiff is seeking appellate review in this Court of decisions by the	
19 20	Washington Supreme Court or other Washington state courts, this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear	
20	such an appeal for the reasons set forth in the order to show cause. As the Court noted, the United	
22	States Supreme Court has held that "a United States District Court has no authority to review final	
23	judgments of a state court in judicial proceedings." District of Columbia Court of Appeals v.	
24	Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983). Instead, the Supreme Court has indicated that "[r]eview of such	
25	judgments may be had only in this Court" (i.e., the United States Supreme Court). <u>Id.</u>	

ORDER - 1

(2) Plaintiff states in his response to the order to show cause that he asks the Court "to treat this case as <u>De Novo</u> having all Washington state court remedies exhausted." (Dkt. No. 6) (emphasis in original). However, even putting aside concerns that Plaintiff may be seeking to litigate claims that were raised or could have been raised in prior state court proceedings, the Court would lack jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's case on a de novo basis.

In his "Appellant's Brief' filed with the Court, Plaintiff stated that this "[t]his case is a breach of contract made by Prime West" (Dkt. No. 4 at 2) and that he is "ask[ing] the court to consider Prime West to pay me \$18,000.00 for the damages produced to me and to my family." <u>Id.</u> at 4. A claim for breach of contract arises under state law, rather than under federal law. <u>See Opera Plaza Residential</u> Parcel Homeowners Ass'n v. Hoang, 376 F.3d 831, 840 (9th Cir. 2004).

A United States District Court only has original jurisdiction over a state-law claim if: (1) the parties are citizens of different states; and (2) the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Here, there is no allegation that Plaintiff and Prime West are citizens of different states. Instead, the materials filed by Plaintiff indicate that his address is in Camano Island, Washington, while Prime West is a business located in Mount Vernon, Washington. (Dkt. No. 4-2 at 2). In any case, Plaintiff has indicated that he is seeking \$18,000 in damages from Prime West. As a result, this Court would lack original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's breach of contract claims even if Plaintiff and Prime West were citizens of different states because the amount in controversy does not exceed \$75,000. These jurisdictional defects are revealed by the existing record before the Court and could not be cured by granting Plaintiff leave to amend his complaint to allege additional facts.

(3) Because this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's claim against Prime West, the Court must dismiss this case without prejudice. Plaintiff is advised that the Court's dismissal of this case is without prejudice to his ability to seek relief in a court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to Plaintiff
Dated: February 21, 2007.

s/Marsha J. Pechman
Marsha J. Pechman
United States District Judge